

THE MÖBIUS FUNCTION ON IMPLICATION SUBLATTICES OF A BOOLEAN ALGEBRA

COLIN G.BAILEY AND JOSEPH S.OLIVEIRA

ABSTRACT. Let B be a finite Boolean algebra. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be the partial order of all implication sublattices of B . We will compute the Möbius function on $\mathcal{A}$ in two different ways.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let B be a finite Boolean algebra.

Definition 1.1. An implication subalgebra of B is a subset closed under $\rightarrow$.

An implication sublattice of B is a subset closed under $\rightarrow$ and $\wedge$.

Implication algebras are developed in [1]. In this paper we wish to examine the poset of implication sublattices of a finite Boolean algebra. By the general theory of implication algebras we know that an implication sublattice is exactly a Boolean subalgebra of $[a, 1]$ for some $a \in B$, and so we are really considering certain partial partitions of the atoms of B .

Let $\mathcal{A}$ be the partial order of all implication sublattices of B ordered by inclusion. Of course $\mathcal{A}$ is a finite lattice.

Our interest is in understanding the Möbius function of the poset $\mathcal{A}$. We consider two methods of finding it. Both methods use a closure operators that provide two ways of closing an implication sublattice to a Boolean subalgebra.

2. METHOD ONE

We wish to compute the Möbius function on $\mathcal{A}$. So let A_1 and A_2 be two implication sublattices of B . Since A_2 is a Boolean algebra and A_1 is an implication sublattice of A_2 we may assume that $A_2 = B$. Let $A = A_1$ and $a = \min A$.

First we define a closure operator on $\mathcal{A}$.

Definition 2.1. Let $A \in \mathcal{A}$. Let $A^c = \{\bar{x} \mid x \in A\}$.

Let $\bar{A} = A \cup A^c$.

Lemma 2.2. If $A \in \mathcal{A}$ then $\bar{A}$ is a Boolean subalgebra of B .

Proof. Clearly $\bar{A}$ is closed under complements. As $1 \in A$ we have $1 \in \bar{A}$ and $0 \in \bar{A}$. It suffices to show closure under joins.

If $x, y \in A$ then $x \vee y \in A$ and $x \wedge y \in A$ as A is an implication lattice. Thus if $x, y \in A^c$ then $x \vee y = \overline{\bar{x} \wedge \bar{y}} \in A^c$.

If $x \in A$ and $y \in A^c$ then $x \vee y = x \vee \bar{y} = \bar{y} \rightarrow x \in A$ as $\bar{y} \in A$ and A is $\rightarrow$ -closed. $\square$

Date: 2009, February 3.

1991 Mathematics Subject Classification. 06A07, 06E99.

Key words and phrases. Boolean algebra, implication algebra, sublattice.

Lemma 2.3. *Let $A \in \mathcal{A}$. Then $\overline{A} = A$ iff A is a Boolean subalgebra of B .*

Proof. By the last lemma $\overline{A}$ is a Boolean subalgebra.

If A is a Boolean subalgebra then $A^c \subseteq A$ so that $\overline{A} = A$. $\square$

Lemma 2.4. $A \mapsto \overline{A}$ is a closure operator on $\mathcal{A}$.

Proof. Clearly $A \subseteq \overline{A}$. As $\overline{A}$ is a Boolean subalgebra we have (by the last lemma) $\overline{\overline{A}} = \overline{A}$. $\square$

Now we recall the closure theorem for Möbius functions – see [2] Proposition 2.1.19.

Theorem 2.5. *Let X be a locally finite partial order and $x \mapsto \bar{x}$ be a closure operator on X . Let $\bar{X}$ be the suborder of all closed elements of X and y, z be in X . Then*

$$\sum_{\bar{x}=\bar{z}} \mu(y, x) = \begin{cases} \mu_{\bar{X}}(y, \bar{z}) & \text{if } y \in \bar{X} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Proof. See [2]. $\square$

Lemma 2.6. *Let $C \in \mathcal{A}$. Then $\overline{C} = B$ iff $C = B$ or C is an ultrafilter of B .*

Proof. Suppose that C is an ultrafilter. Then for any $x \in B$ we have $x \in C$ or $x \in C^c$ so that $x \in \overline{C}$. Thus $\overline{C} = B$.

Suppose that $\overline{C} = B$ and $C \neq B$. We first show that C is upwards-closed. Indeed, if not, then there is some $x \in B$ and $b \leq x < 1$ with $b \in C$ and $x \notin C$. As $\overline{C} = B$ we have $\bar{x} \in C$ so that $\bar{x} \rightarrow b \in C$. But $\bar{x} \rightarrow b = \bar{\bar{x}} \vee b = x \vee b = x$ – contradiction.

Thus C is upwards-closed, and meet and join-closed, so C is a filter. As $C \neq B$ we know that $0 \notin C$. Also $C \cup C^c = B$ so that for all $x \in C$ either $x \in C$ or $\bar{x} \in C$. Thus C is an ultrafilter. $\square$

This lemma together with the closure theorem allow us to use an induction argument to compute the Möbius function. The induction comes from the following lemma.

Lemma 2.7. *Let $A \in \mathcal{A}$ and $a = \min A$. Let c_1 and c_2 be any atoms below a . Then*

$$[A, [c_1, 1]]_{\mathcal{A}} \simeq [A, [c_2, 1]]_{\mathcal{A}}.$$

Proof. Let τ be the permutation of the atoms of B that exchanges c_1 and c_2 . Then τ induces an automorphism of B and that induces an automorphism of $\mathcal{A}$. It is clear that this induces the desired isomorphism between $[A, [c_1, 1]]_{\mathcal{A}}$ and $[A, [c_2, 1]]_{\mathcal{A}}$. $\square$

Now suppose that $A \in \mathcal{A}$ and $a = \min A > 0$. Then we have

$$\mu(A, B) + \sum_{\substack{c \leq a \\ c \text{ a } B\text{-atom}}} \mu(A, [c, 1]) = 0$$

by the closure theorem and lemma 2.6. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(A, B) &= - \sum_{\substack{c \leq a \\ c \text{ a } B\text{-atom}}} \mu(A, [c, 1]) \\ &= -|a| \mu(A, [c, 1]) \end{aligned}$$

where c is any B -atom below a . $|a|$ is the rank of a in B and equals the number of atoms below a . As we now have a reduction in rank (of a in $[c, 1]$) we see that we can proceed inductively to get

$$= -1^{|a|} |a|! \mu(A, [a, 1]).$$

So we are left with the case that A is in fact a Boolean subalgebra of B . We note that in this case, if $C \in [A, B]_{\mathcal{A}}$ then C is also a Boolean subalgebra. We also note that any subalgebra is determined by its set of atoms and these form a partition of n . So the lattice of subalgebras of the Boolean algebra 2^n is isomorphic to the lattice of partitions of n and the Möbius function of this is well known. This gives us the final result that

$$\mu(A, B) = (-1)^{|a|+w(A)-w(B)} |a|! \prod_{\substack{c \text{ is an} \\ A\text{-atom}}} (|c| - |a| - 1)!$$

where $w(A)$ is the number of atoms of A and $|c|$ is the B -rank of c .

3. METHOD TWO

Consider any implication sublattice A of B . Then A is a Boolean subalgebra of $[a = \min A, \mathbf{1}]$. This means we can take any extension $A \subseteq C \subseteq B$ and factor C into $\langle [a, \mathbf{1}] \cap C, [0, a] \cap C \rangle$ and this pairing completely determines C .

It follows that the interval $[A, B]$ is isomorphic to a product of two partial orders:

$$P_1 = \{C \mid C \text{ is a Boolean subalgebra of } [a, 1] \text{ containing } [a, 1] \cap A\}$$

$$P_2 = \{C \mid C \text{ is an implication sublattice of } [0, a]\}.$$

P_1 is known as a partition lattice. P_2 is essentially the same as the interval we are considering with the assumption that $A = \{\mathbf{1}\}$.

So we will compute $\mu(\{\mathbf{1}\}, B)$.

Definition 3.1. Let C be any implication sublattice of B . Then

$$C \uparrow = \{x \mid \exists c \in C \ x \geq c\}$$

is the upwards-closure of C . Note that $C \uparrow = [\min C, \mathbf{1}]$.

Lemma 3.2. $C \mapsto C \uparrow$ is a closure operator and $C \uparrow = B$ iff $\min C = 0$.

Proof. This is immediate. □

It follows from this lemma that $C \uparrow = B$ iff C is a Boolean subalgebra of B .

Lemma 3.3. Let C_1 and C_2 be two Boolean subalgebras of B . Then

$$[\{\mathbf{1}\}, C_1] \simeq [\{\mathbf{1}\}, C_2] \text{ iff } C_1 \simeq C_2.$$

Proof. The left-to-right direction is clear.

Conversely, if $1 > s_{i1} > s_{i2} > \dots > s_{iji} = 0$ is a maximal chain in C_i then the set $\{[s_{ij}, \mathbf{1}] \mid 1 \leq j \leq j_i\}$ is a maximal chain in $[\{\mathbf{1}\}, C_i]$ – since $[s_{i(j+1)}, \mathbf{1}]$ has one more atom than $[s_{ij}, \mathbf{1}]$.

Thus $j_1 = j_2$ and so $C_1 \simeq C_2$. □

We recall that there are $S_{n,k}$ Boolean subalgebras of B that have k atoms – here n is the number of atoms that B has and $S_{n,k}$ is a Stirling number of the second kind, counting the number of partitions of n into k pieces.

Let C_k be any Boolean subalgebra of B with k atoms. We can now apply the lemma and the closure theorem to see that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu(\{\mathbf{1}\}, B) &= - \sum_{\substack{C \uparrow = B \\ C \neq B}} \mu(\{\mathbf{1}\}, C) \\
&= - \sum_{n > k \geq 1} S_{n,k} \mu(\{\mathbf{1}\}, C_k) \\
&= \sum_{\substack{\Gamma \text{ a chain in } [1, n] \\ \Gamma = n = n_0 > n_1 > \dots > n_p = 1}} (-1)^p S_{n_0, n_1} \dots S_{n_{p-1}, n_p} \mu(\{\mathbf{1}\}, C_1) \\
&= \sum_{\substack{\Gamma \text{ a chain in } [1, n] \\ \Gamma = n = n_0 > n_1 > \dots > n_p = 1}} (-1)^{p+1} S_{n_0, n_1} \dots S_{n_{p-1}, n_p}
\end{aligned}$$

3.1. An Identity. We can put these two methods together to see that

$$\mu(\{\mathbf{1}\}, B) = (-1)^n n! = \sum_{\substack{\Gamma \text{ a chain in } [1, n] \\ \Gamma = n = n_0 > n_1 > \dots > n_p = 1}} (-1)^{p+1} S_{n_0, n_1} \dots S_{n_{p-1}, n_p}.$$

3.2. Conclusion & Beyond. We see from the above results that the poset $\mathcal{A}$ is close to the poset of partitions of a set. The analysis we've undertaken shows this in two distinct ways – via the closure operators. In future work we plan to apply these results to an analysis of the subalgebras of cubic implication algebras.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. C. Abbott, *Sets, Lattices, and Boolean Algebras*, Allyn and Bacon, Boston, MA, 1969.
- [2] E Spiegel and C. J. O'Donnell, *Incidence Algebras*, Marcel Dekker Inc., 1997.

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, STATISTICS & OPERATIONS RESEARCH, VICTORIA UNIVERSITY OF WELLINGTON, PO Box 600, WELLINGTON, NEW ZEALAND

E-mail address: Colin.Bailey@vuw.ac.nz

PACIFIC NORTHWEST NATIONAL LABORATORIES, RICHLAND, U.S.A.

E-mail address: Joseph.Oliveira@pnl.gov